



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

VI.—*Notes on Ovid.*

BY DR. EDWARD KENNARD RAND,
HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

I. A MANUSCRIPT OF OVID'S *Heroides*, XXI. 1-144.

THE final edition of Ovid's *Heroides* has not yet appeared. In spite of the achievements of Dilthey, Palmer, Sedlmayer, Peters, Ehwald, and others, much remains to be done for the text, since, despite Sedlmayer's conviction, the classification of the manuscripts does not yet rest on a sure foundation.¹ A problem which must be settled before a genealogy of the manuscripts can be constructed is furnished by the interpolations, or possible interpolations, large and small, with which the text abounds. The most important portions which come under this category are the *Epistula Sapphus*, *Epist. xvi.* 39-142, *Epist. xxi.* 13-248, and the prefatory distichs to some of the letters; but these are not all.²

Yet matters have been simplified, first of all, by the acceptance of the last two passages as genuine by the majority of the best authorities;³ this matter, I am convinced, needs no further discussion. The double letters may now be considered all of a piece, whether Ovid is their author or not. Perhaps, too, the tide of opinion regarding the authorship of the double letters may ultimately turn, as in the case of the letters which Lachmann doubted and, more recently, the *Epistula Sapphus*. Schanz doubtless expresses the current opinion in deciding for the genuineness of this latter work, and though he does not accept the double letters, a voice is heard here and there in their defence; indeed, it would not be surprising if the entire collection were restored to its author before long.

¹ See Sedlmayer, *Prolegomena critica ad Heroides Ovidianas*, 1878, p. 86. On the defects of Sedlmayer's treatment, cf. Peters, *Observationes ad P. Ovid. Nas. Heroid. Epist.* 1882, p. 8, and Dilthey, *Observationum in Epist. Heroid. Ovid. Part. I.* 1884, p. 10.

² See Sedlmayer, *op. cit.* p. 65; Peters, *op. cit.* p. 16.

³ See the summary of this discussion in Schanz, *Gesch. d. röm. Litt.* § 296.

Internal evidence on this question shows us poems which bear the marks of carelessness, yet which only a very clever imitator could have written. The pseudo-Ovid, Dilthey declares,¹ is a poet "qui hoc in genere facultatem Ovidii fere aequiparaverit." External evidence requires us to assume a second edition of the *Heroides* if the double letters are Ovid's. We have no notice of such an edition, but also no proof that it could not have existed. It doubtless was not a product of the days of exile, but there was plenty of time for its achievement before 8 A.D. It is sheer assumption — almost impertinence — to imagine that the facile Ovid was too busy with his other poems to dash off half-a-dozen epistles. It has been suggested that the story of Byblis, *Met.* 9, 529, is evidence that no second edition of *Heroides* had appeared at that time, since otherwise the letter of Byblis would have appeared rather in this edition than in Ovid's longer poem. But the supposition is belittling to Ovid's genius. On the contrary, he is apparently introducing here an intentional novelty — an *epistula Heroidis* in a narrative setting. He welcomes the chance to describe the events leading up to the heroine's act — her passion, her vacillation, the arguments whereby she nerves herself to the act, her succeeding irresolution at the moment of writing, her faltering attempts to start, the resistless rush of words when the letter once begins. This is a situation which the poet could not connote in the letter itself, after the fashion followed in some of the *Heroides*. It may well be that the Byblis story turned Ovid to the old path once more, this time to take up a conceit that his friend Sabinus had suggested in providing his first *Heroides* with answers.²

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 9.

² This possibility is admitted by Bürger, *De Ovid. carminum amatoriorum inventione*, 1901, p. 45, who, however, does not incline to it; it is maintained vigorously by I. de Louter, *De tribus Ovid. Heroid. codicibus Leidensibus*, 1899, p. 24. The latter explains the irregularities in the double letters by the fact that Ovid had not put the finishing touches on these poems at the time of his banishment. Other recent advocates of their genuineness are Pieri, *Quaest. ad Ov. Epist. Heroid. . . . pertinentes*, 1895, p. 71 ff., and Purser, who completed Palmer's edition of the *Heroides*, 1898, p. xxxii.

But to return to the consideration of the text of the *Heroides*, since the double letters are surely of one piece, whatever their authorship, manuscripts containing the omitted parts are at once important as representing a new tradition. The Cydippe letter was discovered probably about the middle of the fifteenth century in a *codex antiquissimus*, and the new text was at once copied into other manuscripts or editions. Obviously a fifteenth-century manuscript, of which *Epist. xxi* is an integral part, is a great desideratum.¹ Moreover, if further investigation should pronounce the double letters genuine works of Ovid, the interpolations in them would naturally rest on the same footing as in the other poems, and not require a different treatment, as at present.² Finally, as to the minor interpolations, von Winterfeld in his review of Traube, *Regula Sancti Benedicti*,³ makes it clear that more is to be expected from the later manuscripts in case, like the Codex Etonensis, they are connected with the tradition from Monte Cassino. It would be presumptuous to attempt new stemmata illustrating possibilities of descent; we need first a more careful study of manuscripts of the mixed class. But several promising clews are already at hand for any investigator who would attempt the maze. The purpose of the present article is merely to publish a collation of a Harvard manuscript which contains the text of *Epist. xxi*. 1–144.

The manuscript in question (I will refer to it as H) bears the number L 25: it is of the fifteenth century, written on parchment, in what seems Italic script. It was acquired by Harvard College in 1902 from the bookseller Quaritch, being formerly the property of Sir Thomas Phillips. A fuller description of the manuscript will appear elsewhere. For the present it is enough to state that the volume consists of three distinct parts. (1) A manuscript (I) containing a letter of the humanist Rinucci da Castiglione written to

¹ Most promising of the manuscripts hitherto examined seem to be Gudianus, 297, s. XV (see below, p. 134), and Parisinus, 7997, s. XV. Neither of these manuscripts has been adequately studied.

² See Peters, *op. cit.* p. 40.

³ *Gött. Gelehrte. Anzeig.*, 1899, p. 897.

Poggio, and including translations from the Greek. (2) A manuscript (II) containing various humanistic works—among them translations by Bruni (Leonardo Aretino)—as well as important classical texts. These latter are the *Germania* of Tacitus, Book xiv (the metrical *de Arte Insitionis*) of Palladius, and the above-mentioned passage from Ovid's *Heroides*. Collations of the Tacitus and Palladius texts will be published shortly elsewhere. (3) A few leaves added at the beginning by some scholar of the fifteenth century, who combined manuscripts I and II, and on one of these initial leaves wrote in capital letters a table of contents for the entire volume.

IN . HOC . VOLVMINE . CONTINETVR . | . . . CORN .
TACIT . DE . ORIGINE . ET . SITV . GĒMANIE . | . . . PAL-
LADIVS . DE . ARTE . INSITIONIS . | OVIDII . EPISTOLA . NO-
VITER . REPERTA . | . . .

The whole was then encased in a fifteenth-century binding of wood covered with leather.

One may make further surmises as to the exact date of the manuscript. The presence of Tacitus's *Germania* in manuscript II shows that this part of the volume was written after 1455, since the *Germania* was not discovered till about that year.¹ This date may be taken as a *terminus post quem*, since the humanistic works here included—the translations of Bruni and the *Liber Augustalis* of Rambaldi—are all earlier. The letter of Rinucci in manuscript I was written certainly before 1459, when Poggio died, probably before 1453, when he left Rome, and may have been much earlier still, as he came to Rinucci for instruction in Greek as early as 1425.² The present copy might well have been made about the middle of the century. The two manuscripts were put together by a scholar of the fifteenth century, as is evident from the style of the capitals in which the table of contents is given, and from the style of the cover. That the manuscripts were

¹ See Sabbadini in *Rivista di Filologia*, XXIX (1901), p. 262.

² See Voigt, *Wiederbelebung des klass. Alterthums*, 1893, II, pp. 45, 84.

combined early rather than late in the second half of the century seems probable from the title which Ovid's work is given in this list, OVIDII · EPISTOLA · NOVITER · REPERTA. The exact date of the discovery of *Heroides* xxi is not known, but may safely be assumed as about the middle of the century. Certainly it was before 1471, when verses 1-144 of this letter appeared in the Roman editio princeps. The binding of our book, it would seem, preceded this date, since one would not be apt to refer to the letter as a novelty after the printing press had introduced it to the reading public. Still, this reasoning needs further examination, for it is conceivable that a tradition started from some manuscript which called attention to the discovery, and that such a notice was copied mechanically in other manuscripts, although the printed edition had appeared. There are, in fact, manuscripts extant containing precisely such a notice. Two codices mentioned by Sedlmayer,¹ Cremifanensis 329 and Vindobonensis 3198, show the superscription (I quote the form given in the latter manuscript) CIDIPPE · ACONTIO · HEROIDVM · OVIDII · VLTIMA · EPISTOLA · RECENS · REPERTA, and this appeared likewise in the manuscript from which the editio princeps was prepared.² Now the Cremifanensis contains several works copied from printed editions, one copy being made as late as 1479. The title given for Ovid's letter: *Cydippe Aconcio herodum Ouidii ultia recens reperta*, is exactly the same in the editio princeps (except *Acontio*), and this is the case also with the superscription to the *Epistula Sapphus*. The titles of *Heroid.* i differ, yet from the above indications it would not be surprising if the manuscripts were copied directly from the editio princeps. Or does it present, after all, an independent, though closely related text? As for the Vindobonensis, if all the pieces it contains were part of the original volume, it could be dated later than the Roman edition, 1471, the Venice edition of 1474, and the Parma edition of 1477; for the volume contains several works written after 1478.³ But I cannot be sure on this point, since Sedlmayer states that the

¹ *Op. cit.* pp. 12, 22.

² *Ibid.* p. 26.

³ See the *Tabulae Codicum* of the Vienna Library, and Endlicher cviii.

manuscript is the product of several hands. Both of these codices, then, *may* have been written before the appearance of the Roman edition, yet may equally well have followed it by several years. Now the superscription in the Harvard manuscript agrees with the titles in the above-mentioned codices, except that the words *recens reperta* do not appear. The text, moreover, bears a close relation to the Roman edition, though not a copy of it, and to the Vindobonensis,¹ so that the title in the manuscript from which H was copied may well have contained the additional words. But the owner of the volume who combined the two manuscripts did not borrow from some other copy the notice which he inserted in the table of contents, for he has it *noviter* (not *recens*) *reperta*. He is probably describing a fact which was true when he made up the volume; he is not mechanically reproducing a title from a manuscript, as he might perhaps do even after the printed edition had appeared. Now if the table of contents was written prior to the editio princeps, manuscript II must be placed earlier still. Its date would be, then, somewhere between 1455 and 1471; the year assigned in Quaritch's *Catalogue*²—1460—may not be far from correct.

Three classes of manuscripts for the text of *Epist. xxi* define themselves readily by external marks.³ One consists of manuscripts which contain the entire epistle. Here we may reckon with certainty only on the archetype of the Parma edition of 1477. It was for some time supposed that a fifteenth-century leaf, added to Laurentianus, xxxvi 27, offered an independent text, but according to Sedlmayer⁴ and Peters⁵ this is a copy from the edition. So, too, the Harleianus 2565,

¹ In the Vindobonensis, as in H, *Epist. xxi* is immediately preceded by the *de Arte Insitionis* of Palladius. The texts in the two manuscripts are very closely related, though neither is copied from the other.

² No. 211, p. 59.

³ Another we might expect, perhaps, to deduce from the Italian translations of the *Heroines* made in the fifteenth century, but these do not contain *Epist. xxi*. 13–248. See E. Bellorini, *Note sulle tradizioni italiane delle "Eroidi" d'Ovidio anteriori al Rinascimento*, 1900.

⁴ *Wiener Studien*, 1881, p. 158.

⁵ *Op. cit.* p. 54.

s. XV, to which Palmer¹ first called attention, believing it to be the basis of the Parma edition, seems to Ehwald² to have been copied from that edition. A detailed comparison of the manuscript and the edition, neither of which is at my disposal, would readily settle this question. Sedlmayer mentions also³ an apparently important source in Codex Lipsiensis 47, s. XV, of which Goetz had furnished him a description. But the volume has since disappeared.⁴ The entire letter is found in various Venice editions, of the years 1486, 1489, and 1492–1498; the latter bears a close resemblance to the Vicenza edition of 1480.⁵

A second class of manuscripts, recognized already, of course, by Sedlmayer,⁶ is made up of those which contain only verses 1–144. This we may now, aided by the information given by our new codex, subdivide into two groups: *a)* Manuscripts containing the title CYDIPPE . . . VLTIMA EPISTOLA · RECENS · REPERTA. Here belong Cremifanensis 329, if this should be assigned the value of an independent manuscript; Vindobonensis 3198; doubtless also H; and the manuscript from which the Roman edition was taken. *b)* Manuscripts without this notice. The following perhaps represent the earlier tradition, before the title was altered: Gudianus 297, s. XV, and Parisinus (formerly Mazarinus), s. XV (XV–XVI, Palmer).⁷ In these manuscripts, it would seem, *Epist. xxi* forms an integral part of the text. They also, like the Venice edition of 1492,⁸ which follows a *codex antiquissimus*, give the division of the *Heroides* into books. As Sedlmayer uses for the Gudianus a collation made in 1774, while the Mazarinus has been examined only for *Epist. xxi*, a careful study of both these manuscripts might lead to valuable results for the text of the *Heroides*.

It would be fruitless to tabulate the distinctive readings of these apparent classes until all available information has been

¹ In his edition, 1898, pp. xxxvi and 157.

² *Jahresbericht über d. Fortsch. d. class. Altertumsw.* CIX (1901), pp. 211, 290.

³ *Op. cit.* p. 24.

⁴ Peters, *op. cit.* p. 54.

⁵ Sedlmayer, *op. cit.* pp. 28–31.

⁶ *Kritischer Kommentar*, p. 75 f.

⁷ On them see Sedlmayer, *Prolegomena*, pp. 4, 16.

⁸ Sedlmayer, *Proleg.* p. 30.

collected. Meanwhile we may note the additional evidence presented by H for the truth of Birt's statement¹ that nearly all the existing manuscripts are not copied from the editions, nor, probably, the editions from these manuscripts, and that thus the text, as we have it, has experienced a complicated history. Further, the new codex contributes something toward the solution of this complexity in suggesting an external criterion for subdividing the second class of manuscripts, and in supplying new material for determining the characteristics of that group to which the Roman edition belongs. Various noteworthy readings will be noticed in the following collation, and while there are flagrant errors, these very errors are proof that the manuscript was not copied from an edition. I have collated the manuscript with the edition of Merkel as revised by Ehwald, 1888, p. 166.

CYDIPPE ACONTIO] CEDIPPE · ACONTIO HEROIDVM |
OVIDII · VLTIMA · EPISTOLA · (*minio*).

[Littera . . . meis] <i>om.</i>	40 obstabas] optas
6 Saevae] seue; e <i>pro ae ubique</i>	41 uelut] ueluit; <i>corr. man. prim.</i>
7 tura] thura	44 Inmodicus] Immodicus
8 favet] fouet	adest] inest
10 Hippolyto] hypolito	45 Ei] Nunc
14 Adjuvor] Adiuor	47 sim] sum
15 vix] ^x ui(x <i>supra adscriptit man.</i> <i>prim.</i>)	49 at] et
16 putas] puta	51 nihil] m
19 agamque] agam q̄	54 submota] summota
25 imperfecta] imperfecta	55 dic mihi] dicam
26 tegitur] cogitur	ne decipe] me despice
cauta] clausa	58 uelis] nolis
27 meos digitos] meus digitus	59 Aut tibi iam nullast] Aut iam nulla tibi est
28 ipse] iste	62 Qua] Quid
29 Quo] Que	nulla tuast] tua nulla est
30 quamque mereris ego] quanque moreris ero	63 quid] quod
32 poenas] penas; e <i>pro oe ubique</i>	61 difficili] difficilis
36 ope] operi	64 tuist] tui est <i>ubique</i>
38 Perditis] Proditis	70 Picta citiae] Pictatite
	72 a] ah

¹ *Gött. Gelehrte Anzeig.* 1882, p. 831 ff.

74 impediebat] impediebat	115 Inprobe] Improbe
77 Delon] delum	118 Penthesilea] pantasilea
79 convicia] conuitia	119 balteus] baltheus
81 Myconon] alicon	120 Hippolyte] hypolite
iam Tenon] antennon	123 Cydippen] Cydippem
82 Delos] bosphor	Schoeneida] ceneyda
84 numquid] nunquid	124 Hippomenes] hyppomenes
ut ante mari] om.	126 vices] faces
90 vestes] uestem	127 bonis] boni
umeris] humeris	129 Cur me cum] Cur cum me
91 sacraſt] grata est	ea] om.
92 tura] thura	profitenda] proficienda
96 Erramusque] Enamusque	132 condicione] conditione
102 Quidquid] Quicquid	134 Linguaque] Lignaque
106 equis] et equis	140 tori] thori
108 Ei] Hei	

II. IMITATION OF OVID IN HORACE.

It has not been imagined that the poet Horace felt any particular admiration for Ovid. "There is no indication in the works of either the reigning or the rising poet of any intimacy between them," says Sellar, in his brief but admirable essay on Ovid's life and works.¹ There is evidence that the two were acquainted, and crossed each other in the social round. When Ovid tells us that "tuneful Horace charmed his ears,"² he means not merely that he found the *Odes* agreeable reading, but, as Sellar implies,³ that Horace gave recitals now and then — by exception — and invited Ovid to them. In this same passage Ovid says gracefully of his

¹ *Encyc. Brit.* 9th ed. XVIII, 78.

² *Trist.* iv. 10, 49: Et tenuit nostras numerosus Horatius aures | dum ferit Ausonia carmina culta lyra.

³ *Ibid.* "Even the fastidious Horace sometimes delighted his ears with the music of his verse." Ovid, speaking of Macer, says explicitly *legit* (v. 43), of Propertius, *recitare* (v. 45). The word would weary if expressed again, so for Ponticus and Bassus (vv. 47-48) the idea is implied. With the mention of Horace, the point, for clearness' sake, is made again, but more allusively than at first. This is but the technique of successful description, an art in which Ovid was not amiss. Then, in contrast with the preceding poets, Virgil is at once named (v. 51), whom Ovid "merely saw." So with Tibullus — nec avara Tibullo | tempus amicitiae fata dedere meae. Strict logic prompts the deduction that relations of *amicitia* did exist between Ovid and the poets first mentioned — Horace included.

illustrious predecessor that he smote an Ausonian harp—the *lyra Romana* which the poet imagined he used,¹ not the pseudo-Hellenic instrument with which some modern critics would equip him. A fine compliment this, and one finer still, at least as obvious, is the frequent imitation of Horace evident in the younger poet's work.² There is no question as to Ovid's feeling for Horace,³ but nobody has imagined that his homage awakened any enthusiastic response—other than an invitation to a recital. What, then, if it can be shown that Horace, in one of his most significant odes, imitates a characteristic verse of Ovid's with the intent of paying his young admirer a palpable compliment?

¹ c. iv. 3, 23, *Romanae fidicen lyrae*.

² See A. Zingerle, *Ovidius und sein Verhältniss zu den Vorgängern und gleichzeitigen römischen Dichtern*, Heft III, Innsbruck, 1871. The only review I have been able to find of this part of Zingerle's important work is by Gross, *Blätter f. d. Bay. Gym.* VIII (1872), p. 127. He adds a few imitations not mentioned by Zingerle.

³ Except by Teuffel, *Gesch. der röm. Lit.* § 219 (4th ed., p. 431, N. 4), who detects a coolness on Ovid's side because he fails to mention Horace with the other poets in *A. A.* iii. 329, and “erteilt ihm erst nach seinem Tode das ziemlich magere Lob: *tenuit nostras numerosus Horatius aures*.” But the praise assumes plumper dimensions with the line which Teuffel does not quote. His opinions have been refuted by M. Hertz, *Analect. ad carm. Horat. hist.*, Breslau, 1876, II, p. 1, and O. Hennig, *De P. Ovidii Nasonis poetae sodalibus*, Breslau, 1886, p. 52. One might consider further whether the inclusion of Horace in the demi-monde's Parnassus—which is as paedagogically special as Quintilian's prescription—would be in place. Callimachus, Philetas, Anacreon, Sappho (quid enim lascivius illa?), and the poet who sings of the fond father “by cunning Geta's art beguiled”—this is fast company for Horace, taking him all in all. To the above number are now appropriately added Propertius, Gallus, Tibullus, then Varro, with his poem on the golden fleece. This last work is cited doubtless for the tale of Medea, erotically significant, and also, possibly, because gay ladies should at least make a feint of familiarity with high epic as well. This explains the introduction of the *Aeneid*, which follows now; for though one might think of Dido and—*nec legitur pars ulla magis de corpore toto | quam non legitimo foedere iunctus amor* (*Trist.* ii. 535), still, the emphasis is laid here on *profligum Aenean* and *altae primordia Romae*—light-o'-loves must talk Shakespere on occasion. But the mention of Virgil—*quo nullum Latio clarius extat opus*—is enough; more seriousness would spoil the point. Horace falls between two stools: he is not frolicsome enough for a place with the amatory, and Virgil is the natural type of great and royal poetry. Ovid ends the tale, then, with his own works. It is not contempt, but the sense of the appropriate, that excludes Horace here and in the somewhat similar list in the second book of the *Tristia*.

In the opening ode of his fourth book, Horace tells his readers that since he now is out of the lists, Venus should betake her to his young friend Paullus Fabius Maximus, "a youth of an hundred arts, who will carry far afield the standards of thy war,"

Late signa feret militiae tuae.

This verse has been tentatively rearranged by various editors from Meineke down in a form which appeals at once as more consonant with Horace's usual manner —

Late militiae signa feret tuae.

It is strange that a line of Ovid's has not been adduced in support of this transposition. In the twelfth poem of the second book of *Amores* the poet describes triumphantly his conquest of Corinna, and after magnifying his own bloodless victory above other conflicts — such as the fight for Helen of Troy — in which much damage had been done to gain a similar prize, concludes that Cupid has given him uncommon privileges, and with them the behest "to carry far afield the standards of his war."

Me quoque, qui multos, sed me sine caede Cupido
Iussit militiae signa movere sua.

We should naturally reckon this coincidence merely as one more Horatian echo in the poetry of Ovid — with incidental gratitude for the support here given to the proposed rearrangement of Horace's verse¹ — if a simple proposition in chronology did not stare us in the face. A moment's consideration makes it most probable that Horace is the imitator. The fourth book of the *Odes*, it is commonly argued, appeared in or about the year 13.² The first poem in this new collection bears, it seems to me, like most dedications, the earmarks of a date near that of publication. The poet has filled his ten lustres — more or less, as *circa* implies. Some editors place the poem, therefore, somewhat before, others, somewhat after 15 B.C. On the strength of a consideration to be suggested

¹ See below, p. 142.

² Schanz, *Gesch. der röm. Lit.* § 260.

later,¹ I am inclined to the latest possible date.² More difficult it is to determine when Ovid's *Amores* appeared, and what was the relation between the first edition in five books and the second in three. The earliest date fixed by external evidence for the collection in its present form is given by iii. 9, an elegy on Tibullus, who died 19 B.C.; the latest date externally determined is marked by the mention in i. 14, 45, of Augustus' conquest of the Sigambri in 15 B.C. Internal evidence, despite various appeals to it, has so far yielded no certain clew.³ Still, our present question requires only the proof that *Amores*, ii. 12, one of the poems on Corinna, was already in circulation when Horace published the fourth book of his *Odes*. Such proof, I believe, is furnished us by Ovid himself. The Corinna poems, he tells us, were the product of his earliest youth—but once or twice had the barber clipped his beard—and they took the town by storm.

Carmina cum primum populo iuvenalia legi,
Barba resecta mihi bisve semelve fuit.
Moverat ingenium totam cantata per Urbem
Nomine non vero dicta Corinna mihi.⁴

On the strength of this passage it is generally agreed that the poems on Corinna, Ovid's earliest work, were written and known about 22 B.C.⁵ Now it is most likely that in the extant collection of fifty odd poems the scant dozen in which Corinna is sun and centre⁶ constitute the poet's choice from

¹ See below, p. 143, N. 1.

² O. Tüselmann, *Quaest. chron. Horat.* 1885, p. 6, states various opinions, himself declining to assign a date more positive than *circa* 15 B.C. Of very recent editors of Horace, L. Mueller, *Oden u. Epoden*, 1900, p. 259, argues that *circa* must imply *before* 15 B.C. C. H. Moore, 1902, sets the date at 14/13.

³ See Ehwald's reviews of J. Heuwes, *De tempore quo Ovidii Amores Heroides Ars Amatoria conscripta atque edita sint*, 1883 (in *Jahresbericht*, XLIII, p. 125), and of P. Martinon : *Les Amours d'Ovide*, Paris, 1897 (*ibid.* 110, p. 168).

⁴ *Tr.* iv. 10, 57 f.

⁵ Schanz, *op. cit.* § 293.

⁶ Némethy, *De libris Amorum Ovidianis*, 1898, p. 18, makes out a list of sixteen, but Ehwald in his review of this publication (*Berl. Phil. Woch.* 1899, 556) and in that of Martinon, *op. cit.* (*Deutsche Litteraturzg.*, 1898, 629), shows how subjective any treatment becomes which would class with the Corinna cycle poems that do not refer to her by name. We may include at least the following

the many effusions of his earliest muse. Further, the poem ii. 12 holds a significant place in the imaginary history; it gives the very moment of his first success — not an idea, one would think, that the poet elaborated in some later addition.¹ There is one internal test that may be profitably applied to this poem, and the others in which Corinna is definitely the theme. Leaving out of account for the moment the verse under discussion (ii. 12, 28), if we find in these poems indubitable imitations of later works, like Horace's fourth book of *Odes* or Virgil's *Aeneid*, the verse from ii. 12 must be considered an imitation, too, and the assumption of an early date for the Corinna poems must fall; but so far as I am able to discover, such imitations do not exist.² Since, then, we may reasonably

poems : i. 5, 11, 12; ii. 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 17. Corinna is not mentioned in i. 12, or ii. 7, but these are inseparable from neighboring poems in which she appears. In ii. 19, she has become a reminiscence, as in the poems of the third book, i. 7, 12. In the last-mentioned article, Ehwald further declares: "Sehr charakteristisch für die Beurtheilung der Corinnagedichte scheint mir, ii. 12, 3 (quam vir, quam custos, quam ianua firma, tot hostes | servabant) wo die vorher in anonymen Gedichten behandelten Züge, i. 4 (on the deception of the *vir*), ii. 3 (on the *custos*), i. 6 (to the *ianitor*), auf Corinna übertragen werden." This remark need not imply that ii. 12 is necessarily late, for one may as logically conceive the poems in question as developments from the suggestions offered in ii. 12, 3. Ehwald may mean merely to emphasize the fact that Corinna is an imagination, a lay figure for familiar erotic costumes.

¹ This aspect of ii. 12 so impresses Martinon, who thinks the Corinna poems narrate sober history in chronological order, that he concludes Ovid "forgot" to include it in Book I.

² Ehwald, *Jahresbericht*, XLIII, p. 126, declares, without specifying, that there are traces of the influence of *Carm.* iv on the *Amores*; perhaps these may pertain to other than the Corinna poems. The following coincidences with the *Aeneid* are noted by Zingerle, none of which is sure proof of an imitation : (p. 86) *Am.* ii. 11, 27 exasperet undas ; *Aen.* iii. 285 asperat undas — the situations are quite different ; (p. 78) *Am.* ii. 12, 1 tempora laurus ; *Aen.* v. 246, 539 tempora lauro ; *Am.* ii. 12, 21 nova bella movere and *Aen.* vi. 820 nova bella moventes ; but Ovid might have developed this from Ennius' satis bella moveri, through his own fera bella movebas, *Am.* ii. 6, 25 (p. 4). There is at least one coincidence, also, with Horace's first book of *Epistles*. *Am.* i. 11, 13 (to Corinna's maid, Nape) si (Corinna) quaeret quid agam spe noctis vivere dices, *Epist.* i. 8. 3 (to the Muse, who is to inform young Celsus of the poet's unphilosophical discontent) si (Celsus) quaeret quid agam, dic (Musa) multa et pulchra minantem | vivere nec recte nec suaviter. The connection between the two passages cannot, I think, be denied, yet again, I believe it is Horace who adapts. The simpler message of Ovid's

place ii. 12 among the Corinna poems, which constitute Ovid's earliest work, the date of either of the editions of the *Amores* is of no consequence for our present consideration. The poem ii. 12 may be safely regarded as antedating the first ode of Book iv, even though this were written and published as early as 17 B.C.

Granting that we have to deal with a palpable imitation, and that Horace is the imitator, the purpose of this tribute is not difficult to discern. At the beginning of the ode, in telling us that he has bidden Love's service a final adieu, Horace quotes one of his own verses.¹

Desine, dulcium
Mater saeva Cupidinum —

The line is laden with reminiscence. It is a symbol of what his lighter poetry of the earlier time had meant to him; and it had meant much. For are not Horace's loves real? We may not know their street and number; yes, even the honest endeavor to distinguish good Cinara from the imaginary throng is, I suspect, something like the consoling faith that Plato wrote *one* authentic letter. This endeavor we may forego, but not the conviction that the love-poems of Horace are real: in them he has created the imaginary reminiscence, sympathetic, chivalrous, pleasantly illumined with wit and genial self-ridicule—as real emotions, these, as others which find expression in Venus' liturgy. So it is a reminiscence of a reminiscence that we have here—mater saeva Cupidinum. But these days are over, Horace declares—splendide mendax, for he was just in the prime of them. Hot youth has sped, so Venus may speed too—to the court of young Paullus Fabius Maximus, “noble and comely, a lad of an hundred arts, who shall carry far afield the standards of thy war.”

impassioned lover is expanded into a witty parody, quite in Horace's manner; the Muse plays the part of a go-between, a Nape. The whole gains point when we reflect that Celsus, like Paullus Fabius Maximus, was one of Ovid's intimates; see below, p. 146. Of course there are, in the Corinna poems, various imitations of Horace's earlier verse: cf. *Am.* ii. 8, 9 ff. and *C.* ii. 4; *Am.* ii. 13, 19, and *C.* iii. 22, 2; *Am.* i. 12, 13, and *Sat.* i. 8, 1.

¹ *C. i. 19. 1:* Mater saeva Cupidinum.

Now Paullus Fabius Maximus was a most intimate friend of Ovid. Already conspicuous as an advocate, already climbing the rounds of political distinction, he had also the interests of literature at heart. Juvenal mentions him among typical patrons of poetry in the Augustan age.¹ Horace doubtless saw in him the promise of a new Maecenas. With this direct mention of Fabius and no less pointed, because allusive, citation of Ovid, he takes off his cap to the rising generation, to Ovid, who heads the coming school. Why not pay a decent courtesy to a youngster who writes clever poetry and shows his sense by copying some of the good things in one's own verse?

The line that Horace adapts makes a good symbol. What more characteristic of Ovid's elegies than the idea — militat omnis amans? We cannot point surely to *Amores* i. 2, 7, 9, ii. 9 as specimens of his earliest work, but the conceit appears in one of the Corinna poems (i. 11, 12) as well, phrased in the same words, which fall into similar positions in the verse —

In me militiae signa tuere tuae.

Horace seized intuitively on a most typical bit in Ovid's verse and — a point that adds new support to Meineke's suggestion — he doubtless reproduced the metrical effect of the line, as well as the phrase, to make his meaning unmistakable. Book iv has sometimes been thought to suffer from lack of a dedication : both Maecenas and Augustus are absent in the

¹ *Sat.* vii. 95. An excellent account of Paullus Fabius Maximus is given by G. Graeber, *Quaestionum Ovidianarum, Pars Prior*, Elberfeld, 1881, p. x ff. I cannot follow him, however, in his attempt to show that Fabius was not a patron of poetry (p. xi). Starting with Juvenal's statement that a Fabius — mentioned in the same breath with Ovid's friend Cotta — played this rôle, we may complete the picture with the lines which Ovid addresses to the present Fabius, *Epist. ex Ponto*, i. 2, 131: Ille ego sum qui te colui, quem festa solebat | inter convivas mensa videre tuos: | ille ego qui duxi vestros Hymenaeon ad ignes | et cecini fausto carmina digna toro: | cuius te solitum memini laudare libellos . . . | cui tua nonnunquam miranti scripta legebas: | ille ego de vestra cui data nupta domo est. Although so intimate with Fabius, and connected with him by marriage, his attitude to him, as Graeber (p. xii) and others have pointed out, is one of deference — like that of a poet to his patron.

opening ode. This is because Horace is devoted to an ideal still higher than attachment to a friend and patron or loyalty to the saviour of the state. The Muse claims his first homage — si spiro et placebo, tuum est. The prospects of poetry are uppermost in his mind.¹ Old Horace, modern of the moderns, turns with enthusiasm to greet his young compeer. Mater saeva Cupidinum — that is his own past. Late militiae signa feret tuae — that is the future, big with hope. There is something of the true ring in the *Amores*.

In what way does Ovid show his gratitude for this striking commendation? To his outspoken admiration for Horace in the previously quoted passage from the *Tristia*² should be added the steady stream of imitation running through all his works — no subsequent poet, an eminent critic declared,³ can show so many reminiscences of Horace's verse. This is in itself acknowledgment enough; yet, looking farther, the reader, I think, will discover a peculiar significance in some of Ovid's borrowings. He does not simply appropriate thoughts or "beauties"; he imitates *mit einem Tone*, intentionally brings before us the whole context from which he

¹ *Carm.* iv. 2 is mainly a panegyric on the Emperor. Thus the opening of the second series of odes corresponds substantially to that of the first. In *Carm.* i. 1 Horace declares his allegiance to the Muse, in *Carm.* i. 2 he pays his homage to the Emperor. The difference between the two openings is that in the latter the initial ode is not addressed to Maecenas. This, as has often been remarked, is not an intentional slight; Horace's good sense prevents him from dedicating to Maecenas a work which the Emperor had asked him to compose. But the fact that a panegyric on Augustus is not plumped in at the start is no sign that Horace feels coolly towards his royal patron; he simply does not care to spoil by overemphasis the fine series of eulogies which form the backbone of the book (*Odes* 4, 5, 6, 14, 15). This consideration tends, I believe, to show that the first ode of this book was written last. If Horace had not to reckon with the five odes just mentioned, he might well have made the initial piece a dedication to the Emperor, even as *Carm.* i. 1 is addressed to Maecenas. But supposing them already completed, we can see why the first ode was given its present character. If, then, it followed the panegyrical odes, its date is 13 B.C. Another reason why the ode is not addressed to Augustus or any other mortal, is that Fabius Maximus and Ovid furnish personality enough.

² See above, p. 136 f., and for Ovid's reason for omitting mention of Horace where some critics would expect it, p. 137, N. 3.

³ M. Hertz, *op. cit.* ii, p. 7 : cum inter omnes poetas nemo fere tam constanter Horatium referat.

selects, incorporating that, reminiscentially, in his own description. Thus when we read the verse (*Met.* 3. 353)

Multi illum iuvenes, multae cupiere puellae,

followed (v. 355) by

nulli illum iuvenes, nullae tetigere puellae,

we not only note a clever adaptation which dispenses with a harsh elision,¹ but can image something of the splendor of Catullus' wedding-hymn, skilfully put into a new setting. This quality appears often in Ovid's imitations,² and is very marked in his reminiscences of Horace. Reminiscence is the exact word—not mere imitation of an idea or phrase, but the suggestion of a situation, and of the poet who created it. One may turn for further illustration to Ovid's reminiscences of his own verse. The ending of *Trist.* iv. 10, for instance, with the repetition of the last line from the epilogue to the *Metamorphoses*, shows that the poet is thinking of his greatest work in connection with his coming immortality; or again, the imagery in the opening verses of *Trist.* iii. 8 takes us back at once, with something of the pain of contrast, to the light-hearted days when *Amores* iii. 6, 13 ff. was written. This last is a reminiscence strikingly akin in spirit to Horace's *mater saeva Cupidinum*. An instance of similar imitation of Horace meets us at the very start in *Amores* i. 15. This poem, in character an epilogue,³ may possibly have appeared in the first edition of the *Amores*, serving as an *envoy*. If this is so, and if the first edition preceded *Carm.* iv, then the passage in question should be ranked with the imitations of *Carm.* i–iii already noted.⁴ If, however, it appeared after the publication of *Carm.* iv—Zingerle⁵ notes the possible influence of

¹ See *Met.* ed. Haupt-Ehwald *ad loc.*

² For excellent remarks on this matter, see Zingerle, *op. cit.* p. 35, who points to the same characteristic in Horace's reproductions. A marked change of situation, as he shows, may be employed for humorous effect, thus resulting in parody. An instance of this last we may now recognize, if I am right, in Horace's *Epistles*, i. 8; see above, p. 140, N. 2.

³ Martinon, *op. cit.* p. xiv, imagines it a *prologue* to Book iv of the first edition.

⁴ See above, p. 140, N. 2.

⁵ *Op. cit.* p. 14 f.

Carm. iv. 9—it is the poet's first distinct acknowledgment of Horace's favor. The poem strikes the chord which sounds so clearly in Horace's later odes—the thought of the poet's immortality. Ovid looks forward to a choir invisible in which Homer, Hesiod, Callimachus, have their place. Sophocles is there, Aratus, Menander. Of his countrymen, he names Ennius, Accius, Varro Atacinus, and Lucretius, in whose eulogy he gracefully interweaves one of the poet's own verses—

Carmina sublimis tunc sunt peritura Lucreti
Exitio terras cum dabit una dies.¹

But the list is becoming long. The next immortal, then, is introduced by allusion,—

Tityrus et segetes Aeneaque arma legentur
Roma triumphati dum caput orbis erit.

But something there is, the poet continues, as permanent even as eternal Rome;

Donec erunt ignes arcuque Cupidinis arma
Discentur numeri, culte Tibulle tui.

The mention of Tibullus is capped by that of Gallus. Is Propertius omitted because he was still living, or because there was not room? Catullus, too, had not figured. The closing lines sound again the praises of poetry and end with the words,

Ergo etiam cum me supremus adederit ignis
Vivam parsque mei multa superstes erit.

We picture at once the monument imperishable that Horace's fancy had reared.² Non omnis morior multaque pars mei,—Ovid's meaning is as clear as though he had inserted the poet's name, as he had just done in the similar quotation from Lucretius; he prophesies for himself the renown that his great friend had attained. The whole poem illustrates the same quality of description that we have observed before;³

¹ Cf. Lucretius, v. 95: *una dies dabit exitio multosque per annos | sustentata ruit moles et machina mundi.*

² *Carm.* iii. 30.

³ See above, p. 136, n. 3.

Ovid is not averse to the catalogue, but when the catalogue begins to pall, it shades into connotation. And the most important thought may not be the most directly expressed.

Other instances of this allusive imitation might be cited. In close connection with the above is the epilogue to the *Metamorphoses*, which may be briefly described as a summary of Horace *Carm.* iii. 30 in a different metre. An interesting case to which Zingerle¹ does justice is *Tristia* iv. 8, 19, where Ovid describes his retirement from letters in the manner of Horace's first epistle. In particular, Ovid's references to his work and fame will be found to have some touch of Horace about them. Without dwelling further on these passages, I would call attention, in concluding, to one of the latest of Ovid's poems, *Epist. ex Ponto* i. 9. This is a letter to Maximus, on the death of their common friend Celsus; it is in essence a threnody. Celsus, I believe, is the youthful poet whom Horace mentions in his epistles,² and Maximus is Paullus Fabius once more. Some scholars think differently, assuming "some other" Celsus,³ and for Maximus, Ovid's friend Cotta Maximus, son of Messalla.⁴ Truth to tell, there is no absolute evidence on either side. But is not the situation crystallized with the following lines? Ovid is speaking of the esteem in which Maximus was held by his departed friend (v. 35) —

Nam tua non alio coluit penetralia ritu
Terrarum dominos quam colis ipse deos.

Terrarum dominos evehit ad deos,⁵ — the verse is transplanted from Horace, rendering its original effect despite the new metrical setting, even as Horace refashioned

Iussit militiae signa movere suae.

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 17.

² i. 3, 8. Compare above, p. 140, N. 2.

³ So Klebs, *Prosp. Imp. Rom.* 1897, I. 334. For the other view, see e.g. O. Hennig, *op. cit.* p. 14 f.; Pauly-Wissowa, VI. 1882.

⁴ So Riese, and Graeber, *op. cit.* p. x f., against Merkel, Nipperdey, Teuffel. Klebs, *loc. cit.*, leaves the question undecided; Celsus, he states, is amicus Ovidii et (Paulli Fabii?) Maximi. Cf. Dessau, *ibid.* II. 49; so Pauly-Wissowa, VI. 1882.

⁵ *Carm.* i. 1, 6.

Does not the poet, once more, call up a definite picture? These friends of his must be the young Celsus and Fabius whom Horace had fathered; and in this mention of their intercourse, the reminiscential verse brings to mind their relations with him. It is the same scene that we know from the *Epistles* — Horace in years, surrounded by young devotees, receiving homage and dispensing advice.¹ If this interpretation is correct, Ovid was thinking both of Horace and of the first ode of Book iv when he wrote this letter to Maximus on the death of their common friend. Am I reading too much into Ovid? Not if one grants, what I think we may safely accept, namely, that Horace in *Carm.* iv. 1 imitates a verse of the younger poet. Bearing in mind the importance of this compliment and the nature of Ovid's imitations in general, we need not be surprised if some of his reminiscences of Horace are symbols of a further meaning.

¹ In what I feel must be a later poem, Ovid applies the same line with a new effect: *Epist.* ii. 2, 1, Nec nos Enceladi dementia castra secuti | in rerum dominos movimus arma deos. It seems more probable that he should first embody the line completely, and then change it in a second reproduction than *vice versa*. In this case a flavor of his first meaning still hangs about the present passage. However, if Wartenberg, *Quæst. Ovid.* Berlin, 1884, pp. 74, 88, is right in placing i. 9 among the latest of the letters from Pontus, we may conceive that ii. 2 gives the ordinary sort of imitation, while in i. 9 the poet reverts to the same verse for a new significance. *Epist.* ii. 2 followed soon after Tiberius' triumph in A.D. 13: see Wartenberg, p. 77. For i. 9 Wartenberg's argument is that the letter shows Ovid to have been a resident at Tomi for some time. But supposing the date were 12, a year before ii. 2 was written, that would allow him four years of banishment; and with Ovid one day was as a thousand, at Tomi.